

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-43 are pending in this application. In the Office Action mailed May 24, 2004, the Examiner rejected claims 1-8, 11, 12, 15-26, 29-36, and 39-43 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,627,996 to *Bauer*, in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,675,261 to *Shandony*; and rejected claims 9, 10, 13, 14, 27, 28, 37, and 38 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over *Bauer* in view of *Shandony*, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,308,246 to *Hagersten*.

In view of the aforementioned amendments and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejections of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

The Examiner rejected claims 1-8, 11, 12, 15-26, 29-36, and 39-43 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over *Bauer* in view of *Shandony*. To establish a prima facie case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, the prior art reference as modified must teach or suggest all the claim elements. (See M.P.E.P. § 2143.03 (8<sup>th</sup> ed. 2001)). Second, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the reference or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or combine the reference teachings. (See M.P.E.P. § 2143 (8<sup>th</sup> ed. 2001)). Third a reasonable expectation of success must exist. Moreover, each of these requirement must "be found in the prior art, and not be based on applicant's disclosure." (M.P.E.P. § 2143.03 (8<sup>th</sup> ed. 2001)).

Claim 1, as amended herein, provides for:

A method for accessing file system entities, comprising:  
receiving a request from a node to access a file system entity having an entity name;  
searching for an alternate entry corresponding to the file system entity, the alternate entry comprising the entity name extended by an expandable sequence;  
expanding the expandable sequence by a value corresponding to the node, wherein the node comprises a process; and  
retrieving information corresponding to the expanded sequence.

Applicants respectfully submit that *Bauer* in view of *Shandony* do not disclose or suggest this claimed combination of steps, for example, the references do not disclose or suggest at least “expanding the expandable sequence by a value corresponding to the node, wherein the node comprises a process.”

With respect to claim 1, the Examiner alleged that *Bauer* discloses: “receiving a request from a node to access a file system entity having an entity name; and searching for an alternate entry corresponding to the file system entity, the alternate entry comprising the entity name extended by an expandable sequence.” The Examiner also admitted that *Bauer* does not disclose “expanding the expandable sequence by a value corresponding to the node; and retrieving information corresponding to the expanded sequence.” Instead, the Examiner alleged that *Shandony* teaches those features.

As noted above, the Examiner admitted that *Bauer* does not disclose “expanding the expandable sequence by a value corresponding to the node.” Applicants agree. Accordingly, *Bauer* does not disclose, teach, or suggest “expanding the expandable sequence by a value corresponding to the node,” as recited in claim 1.

The Examiner uses *Shandony* to allege a disclosure of “expanding the expandable sequence by a value corresponding to the node; and retrieving information corresponding to the expanded sequence.” *Shandony*, however, makes no mention of

expanding the expandable sequence by a value corresponding to the node, wherein the node comprises a process, as presently claimed.

*Shandony* discloses a technique for reducing repeated accesses to the same data store entry by providing request based caching of data store entries (*Shandony* col. 1 lines 61-63). *Shandony's* access management provides identity management services and/or access management services for a network (col. 5, lines 32-34). The access management system limits user access to resources on web servers based on user identification (figs. 1, 6; col. 5, lines 58-63; col. 8 line, 61-col. 9, line 29). A user can access resources on the web servers via a uniform resource locator ("URL"), which can include query data such as user identification (col. 6, lines 40-50). Once a user has requested resources, an Identity Server translates the request and identifies programs corresponding to functions called for in the request, including peripheral programs (col. 45, lines 38-47; fig. 38).

While the claimed invention "expands the expandable sequence by a value corresponding to the node, wherein the node comprises a process," *Shandony* appends to a URL the user identification corresponding to a user. Appending a user identification to a URL is not the same as expanding the expandable sequence by a value corresponding to the node because a user is not a node comprising a process. As such, *Shandony* does not teach expanding the expandable sequence by a value corresponding to the node, wherein the node comprises a process. Accordingly, *Shandony*, either alone or in combination with *Bauer*, does not teach or suggest "expanding the expandable sequence by a value corresponding to the node, wherein

the node comprises a process,” as recited in claim 1. For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that claim 1 is patentable over *Bauer* in view of *Shandony*.

Because claims 11, 18, 19, 29, and 39-42 are independent claims that recite language similar to that which distinguishes claim 1 from *Bauer* in view of *Shandony*, Applicants submit that claims 11, 18, 19, 29, and 39-42 are patentable over *Bauer* in view of *Shandony*, for at least the reasons given with respect to claim 1.

Dependent claims 2-4, 6-8, 12, 15-17, 20-22, 24-26, 30-32, 34-36, and 43 are allowable not only for the reasons stated above with regard to their respective allowable base claims, but also for their own additional features that distinguish them from *Bauer* and *Shandony*.

With regard to the Examiner’s rejections of claims 9, 10, 13, 14, 27, 28, 37, and 38 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over *Bauer* in view of *Shandony* and further in view of *Hagersten*, Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections as well.

Claims 9-10, 13-14, 27-28, and 37-38 are dependent claims depending on independent claims 1, 11, 19, and 29, respectively. Applicants respectfully submit that *Hagersten* is not sufficient to overcome the deficiencies of *Bauer* and *Shandony*. Specifically, *Hagersten*, alone or in combination with *Bauer* and *Shandony*, does not teach or suggest expanding the expandable sequence by a value corresponding to the node, wherein the node comprises a process. Therefore, claims 9-10, 13-14, 27-28, and 37-38 are patentable over *Bauer* in view of *Shandony*, and further in view of *Hagersten* for reasons similar to those stated above with respect to independent claims 1, 11, 19, and 29. Moreover, Applicants submit that claims 9-10, 13-14, 27-28, and 37-38 are allowable not only for the reasons stated above with regard to independent

claims 1, 11, 19, and 29, respectively, but also for their own additional features that distinguish them from *Bauer*, *Shandony*, and *Hagersten*.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,  
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: August 24, 2004

By: 

Joshua C. Liu  
Reg. No. 55,391